| • | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 09/989,339 | FALCO ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | David Guzo | 1636 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: <u>allowed</u> | | |
| (1) <u>David Guzo</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) Lynne M. Christenbury. | (4) | , |
| Date of Interview: <u>13 June 2005</u> | Time: <u>10:15 AM</u> | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: None | | |
| Claims discussed: 19 and 32 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: None | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet | | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| David Muna | | |
| (Examiner/SPÉ Signature) (Applican | t/Applicant's Representative S | ignature – if appropriate) |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' representative gave approval for an examiner's amendment to claim 32, wherein said amendment placed the case in condition for allowance. The defect in claim 32, which was identified by PUBS, involved claim 32 being dependent upon cancelled claim 30. The claim was amended to be dependent upon claim 19.